DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 399 EA 005 986

AUTHOR Krepel, Wayne J.
TITLE A Survey of School Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for Dealing with Field Trips in Selected Similar School Districts in the United States.
PUB DATE 3 May 74
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation Annual Meeting (Buffalo, New York, May 3, 1974); A related document is ED 066 821

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; *Board of Education Policy; Educational Policy; Educational Research; Elementary Schools; Field Instruction; *Field Trips; Literature Reviews; Principals; *School Districts; School Policy; School Surveys; Secondary Schools; Student Transportation; Supervisors; *Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The existence of board policy and/or administrative procedures for conducting field trips may relieve teacher anxieties about their responsibilities during such trips and induce them to use this instructional tool more frequently. Unfortunately, such policies or procedures often do not exist or are unwritten and therefore open to question. This study investigated school board policies and/or administrative procedures for dealing with field trips in a random sample of smaller school districts of the United States. The superintendent of the school system in these districts was contacted, using a questionnaire designed to elicit responses dealing with board policies relating to field trips. The study found that (1) 79 percent of the school districts surveyed had policies dealing with field trips, two fifths of which were written; (2) over 90 percent of the respondents indicated that their policy permitted the use of field trips; and (3) the building principal was most often designated as being the person responsible for determining the acceptability of field trip sites. Other findings, conclusions, and recommendations are included in the report. A bibliography is included. (Author/JF)

ED 089399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH FIELD TRIPS IN SELECTED SMALLER SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Wayne J. Krepel, Ed.D.

Associate Professor of Education
Indiana University at South Bend

Prepared Under Faculty Research Grant

Number 26-651-44

Presented

Annual Meeting

National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation

Buffalo, New York

May 3, 1974

EA 005 986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
	The Problem	1
	Background	1
	Statement of the problem	2
	Importance of the study	2
	Methods of Procedure and Sources of Data	2
	Obtaining the population	2
	Design of the questionnaire	3
	Treatment of the data	4
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Definitions of Terms Used	4
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
	School Board Policies	6
	Administrative Procedures	8
	The Field Trip	10
	Value of Field Trips	12
	Summary of the Literature	17
III.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	19
	Mailing and Receipt of the Questionnaire	19
	Analysis of Data	21
	Additional Analyses	32
	Summary	35

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . 36

Summary 36

Summary of the Findings 37

Conclusions 38

Recommendations for Further Study 39

BIBLIOGRAPHY 40

APPENDIX 44

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Responses to Questionnaires Classified by Size of Community	20
2.	Responses to Questionnaires Classified by Size of High School Graduating Class(es) .	21
3.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Board Policy Concerning the Use of Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size	22
4.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Board Policy Concerning the Use of Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class	23
5.	Responses Pertaining to the Existence of Written Board Policies Concerning the Use of Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size .	23
6.	Responses Pertaining to the Existence of Written Board Policies Concerning the Use of Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class	24
7.	Responses Pertaining to Board Policy Dealing With Permission to Use Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size	25
8.	Responses Pertaining to Board Policy Dealing With Permission to Use Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class	25
9.	Persons or Groups Within School Districts Who Pass Upon the Acceptability of Field Trip Sites (Destinations)	27
10.	Criteria Used in the Determination of Educational Acceptability of Field Trip Sites	28

TABLE PAGE

11. Policies Which Specifically Mention Acceptable Means of Transportation to be Used on Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size 30

12. Policies Which Specifically Mention Acceptable Means of Transportation to be Used on Field Trips - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class 31

13. Type of Transportation Used in Conduct of Field Trips 31

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

THE PROBLEM

Background. Community resources have been utilized for many years by teachers to supplement their instructional program. Part of this utilization of community resources requires teachers to take their children outside the normal classroom environment on "field trips." In an effort to prevent schools from becoming isolated from reality, teachers have taken and will continue to take children into the community. The field trip has given students the opportunity to learn in a setting which gives them direct, first-hand experience with the subject under study.

Teachers and school administrators have expressed concern about their responsibilities during these field trips. School board policies and administrative procedures often either do not exist or at best are unwritten and therefore open to individual question.

Schools have recognized that conditions outside the classroom are not the same as within the "protected environment" of the classroom. Children may expect more freedom when away from the school building but in reality the field trip may necessitate greater restrictions. The existence of board policy and/or administrative procedures for conducting field trips may relieve anxieties and cause the teacher to

utilize this instructional tool more frequently.

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the school board and/or administrative policies concerning, and administrative procedures for dealing with, field trips in selected smaller school districts of the United States.

Importance of the Study. Educational administrators have long been interested in the formulation of school board policies and in their implementation at the operational level. Today, the schools are subjected to more and more pressures to use field trips as an integral part of the total instructional program. This study was intended, therefore, to add to the body of knowledge dealing with school board policies concerning the use of field trips, and the administrative procedures used to implement these policies. This study is a replication of a previous study (Krepel and DuVall, 1973) of schools in cities of 100,000 and more population.

METHODS OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

The purposes of this section were to describe: (1) the methods used in obtaining the population; (2) the design of the questionnaire; and (3) the statistical treatment of the data.

Obtaining the population. "Selected smaller school districts" in the United States were to be investigated for this study. A random selection of school districts in areas

with less than 100,000 was made, utilizing Patterson's American Education, 1972 Edition. A total of 700 districts was selected, without replacement.

Questionnaires, together with a covering letter, were mailed to the school superintendents of these selected school districts. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed approximately one month later to those superintendents who had not responded to the initial request for information (Appendix A).

Design of the questionnaire. The initial questionnaire was modified from a questionnaire used previously by the author in a study dealing with field trips as utilized by school districts in large cities (100,000 or more population) on the basis of experience gained in that study.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit the following information: (1) to ascertain the existence of school board policies (written or unwritten) pertaining to field trips; (2) to determine the person(s) or group(s) who pass upon the acceptability of such trips and supervise them for the schools and school districts; (3) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these trips; and (4) to obtain copies of written policies and administrative procedures used in implementing these policies in the individual school districts.

Treatment of the data. All data were analyzed and reported as a per cent of the total replies received to the questionnaire. Analyses were made of the number of replies received by population size of the respondent school districts as determined by the size of the high school graduating class, as well as other demographic data.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of any investigation conducted by the use of normative survey techniques existed in the study. A further limitation resulted from the fact that the reliability of the data depended upon the accuracy with which the respondents (chief school administrators or their designated agent) responded to the instrument.

Further limitations may well be the difficulty in differentiating between board policies and administrative procedures.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Field trip. A trip arranged by the school and undertaken for educational purposes, in which students go to places where the materials of instruction may be observed and studied directly in their functional settings; for example, a trip to a factory, a city waterworks, a library, a museum, etc. Syn. instructional trip; school excursion; school journey; see plant tour. (Good: 239)

Instructional trip. Syn. field trip. (Good: 307)

Policies. A policy is a general statement of principle written in clear, concise language, providing the school administrator guidelines within which to operate. A policy statement reflects careful and deliberate study and has an enduring quality. (Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff: 6)

Procedures. A procedure is a method by which a policy is achieved and is the means through which a desired goal may be attained. A statement on procedure usually gives the steps for achieving the objective stated in the policy. . . . procedure statements on the same general matter vary from place to place, because each statement must reflect the unique or peculiar conditions in the particular school system. (Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff: 6)

Others. All other terms were defined as stated in Good's Dictionary of Education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature which dealt with the area under study in these projects was divided into four distinct areas. The first area dealt with the formulation of school board policies and the second with the implementation of these policies through administrative procedures. The third area was concerned with a brief review of the field trip as an instructional tool. The final area was a summary of literature which dealt with the value of field trips.

SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES

The power of a board of education to establish policies for the operation of schools is one of the rights and responsibilities vested in it by law. Greider, Pierce, and Rosenstengel wrote that in most states boards of education are granted great authority over school affairs in their districts. They note that one exception is the State of California where the Education Code is highly specific. These are powers not only of specific legal requirements, but also of a wide field of discretionary or implied powers. (115-17)

One of the ways in which a board of education may function most effectively is through the enactment of policy statements for the guidance and direction of both the

board and school personnel. These policies, when enacted, are the result of a great deal of planning. (Greider et al: 114-15)

Knezevich observed that "Policies are more likely to fulfill their potentials if reduced to writing", yet he went on to add that the development of a written policy statement was a relatively new phenomenon. Since the end of World War II, studies have indicated that it was difficult to find a publication dealing with school board activity which failed to make reference to the need for written school board policies. (224-25)

Moehlman compared written board policies to a yardstick by which all suggestions, recommendations, and procedures may be judged impersonally. He indicated that many laymen and administrators tend to view written policies as constrictive and they feel that they hamper action. His view of school board policies is that the written policies serve as an objective means of resolving differences among the various constituents effected by such policies. (145-46)

Bretsch cited the Hayes and Nugent study concerning the relationships of boards of education and their superintendents. He stated that they "suggest that the superintendent's responsibilities are to execute the policies of the board and advise it on educational matters." (152) Wynn wrote that the board of education's primary function is

legislative in nature. The board, working with the superintendent and his staff, prepares policies and regulations which guide the operation of the school system. He also stated that well-written policy statements tend to insure consistency of action. (25)

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The area of administrative procedures, which is referred to variously as the implementation of board policies, or "rules and regulations," is an area that is not clearly defined. This lack of definition is not at all surprising, and its existence does not come as a surprise to those engaged in educational administration. Wynn stated that responsibility for execution of policy should be delegated to the superintendent of schools and his staff. A clear differentiation must be made between the executive functions of the administrators of the school system and the policy-making or legislative functions of the board of education. In practice, however, it is difficult to distinguish between executive and legislative functions. (25-26)

The Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, writing in the School Executives Guide, stated that while some school board action, as found in the records, may easily be identified as policies, others are often identified as rules or regulations. It is difficult to decide where policy ends and rules and regulations begin. (675-76) The Editorial staff, in citing Polley, further indicated that some may view a statement

as policy, whereas others may view the same statement as a rule. What is desirable, of course, is that a clear, concise statement is made concerning the board's mode of operation. (2)

Both Knezevich (255-57) and Greider, Pierce and Rosenstengel (121-23) believe that it is the duty of the superintendent of schools to implement the policies of the board through administrative procedures which will enable the professional staff to function effectively within the framework established by board policies. Goldhammer, in his book The School Board, clearly supports this viewpoint. (52-55)

The American Association of School Administrators presented a list of classified examples in an attempt to "clarify the distinction between legislative or policy-forming functions and executive functions" in their Twenty-fourth Yearbook. (48-51) This list was illustrative of many common examples but was not intended to be complete or all-inclusive.

Lawson also dealt with the establishment of administrative policy in some detail. He delineated his definitions by the use of the terms "over-all school policies" and "internal policies." He included the area of the selection of instructional materials under the classification of internal policies, without any reference to the involvement of the board of education in the matter. (362-64) This appeared to be contrary to the recommendations presented by many of the other authors.

Mort and Ross discussed, indeed they gave special attention to, the matter of administrative discretion in the application of board policies. They stated that administrators should be given broad discretion in the application of rules and regulations. Administrators should have the authority to make exceptions to the rules. (295)

THE FIELD TRIP

School excursions, or field trips, were extensively used in European countries before World War II. According to Curtis their chief development had been in Germany during the nineteenth century. From Germany the idea spread to the British Isles as well as to other European countries and the Orient. This movement took place during the latter half of the century. (201)

In Great Britain school journeys began in 1890 with children going to the country for the weekend to study nature and geography. By 1911 so many schools were using trips that a non-profit organization, the School Journeys Association, was formed to make arrangements for school trips. (Hall: 151)

In the United States, Charles and Frank McMurry had begun advocating the use of excursions in the teaching of science and geography. By 1903 Charles McMurry had outlined a three-part procedure for taking field trips consisting of: "preparation for the excursion, the trip, and the follow-up activities comprised largely of discussion." (Curtis: 201)

The position of the field trip within the instructional unit has varied. It has been used as an introduction to instruction, as a culminating activity, or within the body of the unit. (Curtis: 201) The field trip has been described as "the most vibrant teaching-learning laboratory to be found." (Sebolt: 410)

At the present time "journeys undertaken by British schools fall roughly into two categories: domestic trips, taken during term time; and journeys abroad." (Hall: 152) These excursions abroad range from an airplane flight from Birmingham to London and back again for geography, to research expeditions to Lapland, Iceland and British Columbia. (Curtis: 151-53) The trips into other countries are not without problems. Impressions made by students upon the citizenry of the country to be visited is of concern to educators. (Anderson: 41)

In the United States field trips can range from a walk around the school yard and through a nearby woods, (Howland: 40) to a two day marine field trip. (Ruth: 32) Howland stated that a field trip may vary from a visit to a fire house or to a meadow or "across the continent or around the world." (1)

School boards usually allow teachers to take their students on field trips. A recent study of school districts in cities of 100,000 or more population disclosed that over

90 per cent of the respondents reported that their school policy permitted the use of the field trip by their instructional staff. (Krepel and DuVall: 38)

VALUE OF FIELD TRIPS

There are a number of values attributed to field trips. Howland says that the main "objective of a field trip is to provide understanding through experience." (1) The field trip is a laboratory which enables teachers "to bridge the gap between what we know and what we do in education." (Sebolt: 410)

The values gained in excursions, according to Hall, are the provision of accurate first hand information, the promotion of better citizenship, the opportunity for social training, the encouragement of the love of travel, the formation of a connecting link between community and school, and the creation of interest. (153) The use of the community and its resources enables the classroom to be expanded to include the entire world of the child. The learning process then includes examples drawn from the real world. (Sebolt: 410)

A field trip increases the student's knowledge of a particular subject but, even more importantly, may increase his desire for knowledge. (Ruth: 32) A field trip may unify a group of children. (Muente: 40) It can make a unit of study more meaningful and make real what has been read

or discussed. (Forester: 15) "Field trips are especially valuable for enriching the background of slow learners, most of whom rarely visit places of educational interest." (The Association of Teachers of Social Studies of the City of New York: 113) Field trips help to develop reading skills as the children plan their outline of what they will do and what things they will try to see. (Olson: 26) Map-reading skills may be developed while riding on a bus. (Olson: 28)

Many early studies evaluated field trips as contrasted with films or other audio-visual aids to learning. Recent studies have evaluated them within the total picture as one of many resources available to the teacher. (Dale et al: 277) Both types of evaluation seem to be valid.

Field trips are generally evaluated by the individual teacher in a rather subjective way. The teacher observes the pupils and forms his opinion on the basis of what he sees. Abraham analyzed the effectiveness of a trip to Washington, D.C., by a group of high school students and he concluded that the "effect of the visit was to increase esteem for the people who make, administer, and interpret the laws of the land." (Dale et al: 278 citing Abraham)

Clark studied 335 sixth grade children. He selected four units, Egypt, Printing, Transportation, and Communications for the experiment. The experiment was carefully controlled so that non-experimental factors would not figure in the results. Interest tests were administered, as well

as achievement tests. Pupils were also afforded the opportunity to write one page of reaction to the unit. After final scores were tabulated and adjusted for pretest scores and mental ages, the experimental groups (field trip) were found to be significantly superior in all units except Egypt, in which the control group was superior. Regarding the absolute retention scores, there were no significant differences between the groups, except in the Printing unit, where the control group was found to be superior to one of the two experimental groups. No significant difference was found between groups in relative retention. (11-13) The results of this study indicate that teachers should constantly evaluate the field trips they take. Some of them may not be achieving the desired outcomes.

In a study by Forester of eight 4B social studies classes the findings were similar to the Clark study. Forester concluded that a significantly greater degree of learning took place as a result of field trips. There was no significant difference in the results of a retention test. (181)

Curtis studied 32 fifth grade children who were divided into two groups to determine what contributions a field trip might make in their unit of study on erosion and conservation of soil. Within certain stated limitations "the conclusion may be that the excursions in this study contributed to understanding when employed as a summary technique." (202)

Curtis goes on to state that "too much should not be expected of the excursion per se." He concluded that the excursion should be used where a useful illustration of the subject being studied is easily accessible in the community, and particularly when students have limited experiences. (210)

A study by Harvey was made of the value of using field trips to acquire new knowledge and to develop scientific attitudes rather than for the purposes of illustration or verification of information. Two sections of thirty-four students each of ninth grade general science classes were selected for the experiment. The unit of study selected was conservation. Harvey stated, when discussing his findings that "the (experimental) students gained an increase in scientific attitudes which is shown by the statistical analysis to have been of scientific value." It was proven practical for a ninth grade general science class to study a part of their environment using the scientific method and it was also demonstrated that a worthwhile excursion can be conducted within a fifty-five minute class period." (242-48)

In Milwaukee, field trips are used in a different way. A number of Orientation Centers for new migrants to the city and transients already within the city were set up in 1960. Children who are culturally disadvantaged but have normal ability are assigned to these centers for varying periods of time, usually one to four semesters, or until they can be

put into the public schools with a chance of success. These children are especially lacking in real life experiences, so the field trip was selected as the focal point of the curriculum, as a means of providing the missing experience at the concrete level. Field trips also provide a background of knowledge on which to build skill conceptualization and abstract thinking, which are so necessary for success in school. (Nuhlicek: 9)

Field trips are used to expand the world of the child and to stimulate his interest in the world around him. These trips are used as material upon which a writing program is built, and discussions can center about the field trip experiences. Mathematics is used to figure out how much trips will cost, what supplies are needed, and how far they will travel on their trip, how long it will take, and the route they will follow. These are but a few of the facets of the Milwaukee program. (Nuhlicek: 9)

Sorrentino and Bell, in a comparison of attributed values with empirically determined values of secondary school science field trips, concluded that substantial experimental research is needed but based upon available information "it is reasonable to say that field trips should be used in the teaching of secondary science." (235)

The preceding studies indicate that field trips can contribute to learning, if they are carefully selected, properly prepared for, and well conducted.

DuVall and Truex reported that approximately ten per cent of teachers employed in a selected Northern Indiana School District will take field trips during a school year. (12-15) Ayars surveyed 92 teachers who were attending a community resources workshop to determine the reasons they did not use field trips with their classes. The reasons given, in descending order of frequency were: too full schedule, lack of transportation, too many pupils in classes, course of study requirements, time consumed by routine duties, the daily class schedule, problems of liability, too time consuming, and fear that some fundamental teaching may be disregarded. Ayars states that extensive utilization is not likely to develop unless favorable conditions are provided by the administration including "a general atmosphere of encouragement as to the use of community resources." (24)

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter has been devoted to a review of related literature in order to provide a background of information and also a rationale for the present study. The review of literature may be seen as two distinct parts, dealing with (1) board policies and procedures for conducting field trips and (2) field trips as an integral part of the instructional program.

School boards should establish broad policies covering the operation of the schools. These policies should be

broad enough to give the school administrators who must operate under them operational latitude and flexibility. Board policies have not been adopted by all boards of education, and in many cases where they have been written and adopted they have not been periodically revised.

The area of administrative procedures, which is the implementation of board policies, is a field that is not at all clearly defined. In many cases it is difficult to determine what is policy and what is administrative procedure. However, it should be noted that in many cases this is not an important distinction. One area that should be given particular attention is the matter of administrative discretion in the application of board policies in administrative procedures.

Educators have utilized the field trip or excursion for over half a century in this country. It had been used before that for some time in Europe. The literature reviewed indicated that the field trip does have definite instructional advantages over the continued vicarious experiences of the traditional classroom. While it is widely used today it is still not utilized by a majority of today's classroom teachers.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purposes of this chapter were to present the results of the analysis of the data of (1) the mailing and return of the questionnaires and (2) the data obtained from the answers to the questions on the questionnaire itself.

MAILING AND RECEIPT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to the superintendent of schools of 750 randomly selected school districts in the United States in population centers of less than 100,000 persons. These letters were mailed April 1, 1973. Approximately one month later (June 12, 1973) a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to those superintendents of schools from whom no replies had been received by the date of the second mailing. Of the 750 questionnaires originally mailed 27 were returned by the postal service for selected reasons. Of the 723 questionnaires assumed to have been delivered (received by superintendents) a total of 441 were returned. This resulted in a return ratio of 61 per cent as a result of the original and follow-up mailing. This ratio is considered to be sufficiently representative of the population sampled to permit generalization to the entire population.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit from the respondent an estimate of the size or type of school district

from which data were requested. Respondents were asked to classify their districts by use of the terms rural, suburban, village, town, and city. Data relative to the number of responses in each category are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Classification	f	Per Cent of Total
Rural	126	29
Suburban	45	10
Village (under 10,000)	91	21
Town (10,000-50,000)	134	30
City (50,000+)	45	10
Total	441	100

In addition, respondents were asked to classify their districts in a manner which would permit inferences being drawn concerning their relative size. It was determined that the size of their total high school graduating class(es) would provide a relative index from which comparisons could be made. An analysis of the responses received to this question is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS(ES)

Range of Size of Graduating Class	f	Per Cent of Total
1 - 25	22	5
26 - 50	44	10
51 - 100	66	15
101 - 200	80	18
201 - 300	59	13
301 - 400	42	10
401 - 500	35	8
501+	86	19
No response	7	2
Total	441	100

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The superintendents of schools were queried concerning the existence of a policy which dealt with the utilization of field trips within their districts. A total of 79 per cent of them responded that their school districts did have such a policy. Twenty per cent of them replied that no such policy existed. Only one per cent of the respondents did not reply to this question. These data are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF BOARD POLICY CONCERNING THE USE OF FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Policy exists	74	82	81	77	87	79
No policy	25	11	18	23	13	20
No response	1	7	1	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the use of field trips by teachers?

It is interesting to note that the smaller school districts, as analyzed in both tables, have fewer policies dealing with field trips than do the larger districts. This is especially apparent in Table 3. Here data presented reveal that a trend toward policies exists particularly in suburban and city districts. Data presented in Table 4, where the size of the high school graduating class is considered as a factor, reveal no clear-cut trend.

An examination of Tables 5 and 6 indicates a disparity between the existence of policy (see Tables 3 and 4) and the existence of written policy. In this survey 79 per cent of the superintendents indicated their districts did have a policy, while only 43 per cent of these same respondents indicated that this policy was written.

TABLE 4. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF BOARD POLICY CONCERNING THE USE OF FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Policy exists	68	80	71	80	81	83	77	83	79
No policy	23	20	29	19	17	17	23	16	20
No response	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the use of field trips by teachers?

TABLE 5. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO THE EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES CONCERNING THE USE OF FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Policy is written	29	49	35	51	64	43
Unwritten policy or no policy	57	44	55	37	27	46
No response	14	7	10	12	9	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the use of field trips by teachers?

Is this policy written?

TABLE 6. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO THE EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES CONCERNING THE USE OF FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Policy is written	27	32	23	39	46	43	43	69	43
Unwritten policy or no policy	64	59	61	45	47	45	49	22	46
No response	9	9	16	16	7	12	8	9	11
Totals	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the use of field trips by teachers?

Is this policy written?

Examination of the data presented in Tables 7 and 8 revealed that 91 per cent of the respondents indicated that their school policy permitted the use of field trips by their teaching staffs. This, when contrasted with the data presented in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6, led to the conclusion that more school districts permit the use of field trips than have a policy, either written or unwritten, dealing with the subject. These data would tend to support the belief that more superintendents are aware of the existence and use of field trips than have written policy regulating the use of this educational tool in the schools.

TABLE 7. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO BOARD POLICY DEALING WITH PERMISSION TO USE FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Use permitted	88	87	95	92	93	91
Use denied	0	2	1	1	0	1
No response	12	11	4	7	7	8

Question: Does your policy permit the use of field trips by teachers with their classes?

TABLE 8. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO BOARD POLICY DEALING WITH PERMISSION TO USE FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Use permitted	91	93	89	90	92	98	89	90	91
Use denied	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
No response	4	7	11	10	8	2	11	8	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your policy permit the use of field trips by teachers with their classes?

Of particular interest was the fact that 37 superintendents failed to respond to this question (8 per cent of the respondents) while only one per cent of those who responded indicated that field trips were in fact denied their staffs as an educational tool.

The building principal was mentioned most often as the person responsible for passing upon the acceptability of field trip sites. This occurred in 86 per cent of the responses received in the survey. Persons or groups mentioned next most frequently were individual teachers (57 per cent), superintendents of schools (40 per cent), and assistant superintendent for instruction (20 per cent). A variety of other persons and/or committees or groups were mentioned with far less frequency. These data are presented in Table 9.

Data are presented in Table 10 indicating the criteria provided on the questionnaire related to choice of field trip sites as being significant, together with the number and per cent of their responses. Of the eight different criteria provided, the superintendents selected five of them in over one-half of their responses as being applicable criteria. The most frequently indicated criteria were: educational significance/suitability; distance (accessibility); administrator and/or teacher judgment (approval); relationship to grade or maturity level of students; and safety. All of the criteria provided on the instrument were chosen with a degree of frequency which should recommend them for consideration in determining field trip sites.

Another area of concern to both teachers and administrators when taking field trips is the matter of injury and liability insurance and its availability. This is or should be of

TABLE 9. PERSONS OR GROUPS WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO PASS UPON THE ACCEPTABILITY OF FIELD TRIP SITES (DESTINATIONS)

Individual or Group	f	Per Cent of Total
Building Principal	381	86
Individual Teacher	250	57
Supt. of Schools	178	40
Asst. Supt./Instruction	89	20
Curriculum Supervisor(s)	33	7
Building Curriculum Comm.	6	1
System-wide Curriculum Committee	5	1
Other	46	10

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases. Totals exceed 100 per cent.

Question: Which person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of field trip sites (destinations)?

Individual Teacher
Building Principal
Building Curriculum Committee
Curriculum Supervisor(s)
System-wide Curriculum Committee
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Superintendent of Schools
Other (please specify)

TABLE 10. CRITERIA USED IN THE DETERMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL ACCEPTABILITY OF FIELD TRIP SITES

Criteria	f	Per Cent of Total
Educational significance/suitability	374	85
Distance (accessibility)	303	69
Administrator(s) and/or teacher judgment (approval)	291	66
Relationship to grade or maturity level of student	273	62
Safety	246	56
Cost	205	46
Availability of time away from school	167	38
Teachers previously visited site	78	18
Other	10	2

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases. Totals exceed 100 per cent.

Question: What are the criteria used for determining the educational acceptability of field trip sites (destination)?

Educational significance/suitability
Distance (accessibility)
Safety
Relationship to grade or maturity level of students
Administrator(s) and/or teacher judgment (approval)
Availability of time away from school
Teachers previously visited site
Cost
Other (please specify)

concern to teachers as well as pupils and their parents. The question relating to this matter on the questionnaire was very difficult to phrase and the results obtained were most difficult to analyze and interpret. One limitation imposed upon the analysis of responses is the differences among states regarding their regulations relating to insurance for liability and injury. This area of concern is subject to court decision within the several states, therefore the data presented are included for information purposes only.

When queried concerning the availability of liability insurance for both pupils and teachers while on field trips the respondents indicated that in 73 per cent of the cases this coverage was available. This finding must be viewed with a high degree of skepticism because of the limitations imposed by the comments made on the instruments. Some respondents indicated that pupils were covered, others only teachers. In 25 per cent of the responses the superintendents indicated that no such coverage was available.

This question failed to elicit the type of response desired, not because of the respondents lack of knowledge, but rather the poor nature of the question involved. Additional treatment of this extremely complex subject may be found in another research report prepared by the authors entitled "A Survey of Laws and Court Decisions in the United States as

Related to Teacher Responsibility and Liability During Field Trips." (ERIC Clearinghouse Accession Number SO 002 358)

This research study was further reported in periodical literature in the October, 1972 issue of the Journal of Law and Education in an article entitled "Teacher Liability During Field Trips." (DuVall and Krepel)

The final area studied was that of board policies which specifically mentioned acceptable means of transportation to be utilized in taking field trips. Examination of the data presented in Tables 11 and 12 reveals that 60 per cent of the board policies include specific mention of acceptable means of transportation while 30 per cent make no mention of this factor.

TABLE 11. POLICIES WHICH SPECIFICALLY MENTION ACCEPTABLE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO BE USED ON FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Acceptable means mentioned	53	69	66	59	62	60
No mention made	33	20	24	35	27	30
No response	14	11	10	6	11	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 12. POLICIES WHICH SPECIFICALLY MENTION ACCEPTABLE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO BE USED ON FIELD TRIPS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Acceptable means mentioned	68	55	62	51	64	69	54	62	60
No mention made	32	36	26	31	27	26	40	27	30
No response	0	9	12	18	9	5	6	11	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school district policy make any specific mention of acceptable means of transportation to be used?

TABLE 13. TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION USED IN CONDUCT OF FIELD TRIPS

Type	f	Per Cent of Total
School Bus	409	93
Walking	229	52
Private Car	159	36
Public Transportation	122	28
Other	12	3

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases. Totals exceed 100 per cent.

Question: Transportation permitted to be used:

Walking
Private Car
School Bus
Public Transportation
Other

The use of the school bus and walking are clearly the most frequently indicated acceptable means of transportation. Of additional interest is the fact that the private car is specifically mentioned as an acceptable means of transportation in 36 per cent of the cases.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

In addition to the analyses of the data previously presented it was determined to subject certain of the factors to additional statistical analysis. For this purpose the chi-square test for independence was used.

Contingency tables were constructed and the "independence value" for each cell of the table was calculated, and from this the chi-square value was computed. The program for the Monroe 1265 Computer was used in all computations.

The first contingency table constructed utilized the data relating to community size (question one) and the persons passing upon the acceptability of field trip sites. In this analysis, as well as all of the other presented, the non-response category was omitted. A chi-square value of 104.553 was computed with 28 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$. Therefore, a relationship exists between the size of the school district and the level at which the acceptability of field trip sites is determined.

The next analysis conducted, in which the size of the high school graduating class (question three) was used as a

variable, revealed a chi-square value of 127.986, with 35 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$. Again, there is a relationship between the size of the school district (as inferred from the size of the high school graduating class) and the level at which the acceptability of field trip sites is determined.

A second set of data were analyzed, in which the variables of community size (question one) and the size of the high school graduating class (question three) were tested for independence against the criteria for the determination of the acceptability of field trip sites (question eight).

In the first analysis of community size and the criteria of acceptability a chi-square value of 14.042 was obtained with 32 degrees of freedom. The hypothesis of independence (unrelatedness) was retained with a $P < .99$.

When the size of the school district (as inferred from the size of the high school graduating class) was compared with the criteria of acceptability, a chi-square value of 26.429 with 56 degrees of freedom was obtained. The hypothesis of independence (unrelatedness) was retained with a $P < .99$.

A third pair of analyses were conducted, in which the variables of community size (question one) and the size of the school district (high school graduating class) were tested for independence against the criteria for the acceptability of different means of transportation (question 11). A chi-square value of 59.659 was obtained with 16 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$.

The second analysis of these data, comparing the school district size with the means of authorized transportation, resulted in an obtained chi-square value of 91.843 with 28 degrees of freedom. This obtained value is significant at $P > .001$.

In summary, the results of the statistical analyses revealed that there was a relationship between the individuals involved in the decision making process and the size of the community and the size of the school district. Inspection of the data revealed that the larger the school district the more removed from the classroom the decision making process became.

When the criteria of acceptability were analyzed it was found that neither of the two variables (community or district size) was a significant determinant of differences among criteria. That is to say that the criteria are equally applicable to all districts in the sample.

Finally, the analyses revealed that there is a statistical relationship between the size of the community and school district and the means of transportation authorized in the conduct of field trips. This was to be expected as the availability of school busses (rural) and public transportation (urban) undoubtedly affected the means of transportation authorized for the conduct of field trips. The statistical analyses merely confirmed what had been previously hypothesized.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the findings which were derived from the analysis of the data.

Within the population of school districts surveyed policies relating to the use of field trips generally exist in both written and unwritten forms. These policies recognize the field trip as a valid form of educational experience for students. Site selection remains within the control of the individual school building in most cases, and specifically with the building principal. The most frequently mentioned criteria for site selection was educational significance and/or suitability.

School busses and walking were most frequently mentioned as acceptable means of access to field trip sites.

Chapter IV is devoted to a summary of the study, to the findings which were made, and to the conclusions drawn from these findings. Finally, recommendations for further study are presented.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter were to present: (1) a summary of the problem and the procedures used; (2) a summary of the findings; and (3) the major conclusions, and (4) recommendations for further study.

SUMMARY

Review of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the school board and/or administrative policies concerning, and administrative procedures for dealing with, field trips in selected smaller school districts of the United States.

This study specifically attempted to elicit the following information: (1) to ascertain the existence of school board policies (written or unwritten) pertaining to field trips; (2) to determine the person(s) or group(s) who pass upon the acceptability of such trips; (3) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these trips; and (4) the modes of transportation authorized within the policy statements and/or practices.

This study was intended to add to the body of knowledge concerned with board policies and administrative procedures used in dealing with field trips.

Design of the study. Data for this study were collected as follows:

1. A random sample of smaller school districts was listed and the superintendent of the school system in these districts was contacted, using a questionnaire designed to elicit responses dealing with board policies in their respective school systems relating to field trips.

2. The data from the analysis of these questionnaires were tabulated and reported as: (1) a per cent of responses to the questionnaires received; (2) the existence of board policies dealing with field trips; (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for the determination of the acceptability of field trip sites; (4) the criteria used in determining the acceptability of these sites; and (5) the modes of transportation permitted under policy. In addition, statistical analyses of selected factors were conducted, utilizing the chi-square test of independence.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

1. The data showed that 79 per cent of the respondents indicated the existence of a board policy dealing with field trips. In about two-fifths of the replies the respondents indicated that this policy was a written one.

2. Over 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that their policy permitted the use of the field trip by their instructional staff.

3. The individual building principal was the person most often designated as being responsible for determining the acceptability of field trip sites.

4. In the identification of criteria for the determination of acceptability of field trip sites the most frequently cited criterion was that the field trip must be educationally significant and suitable. Other criteria which occurred in more than half of the responses were distance (accessibility), administrator or teacher judgment, relationship to maturity level of students, and safety.

5. School busses and walking were the most frequently indicated acceptable means of transportation for use in field trips.

CONCLUSIONS

Four basic conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. On the basis of the replies received to the questionnaire, the field trip is permitted to be used in over 90 per cent of the school districts. Therefore, it is concluded that the field trip is an integral part of the instructional program of the schools.

2. That written policies regarding the use of the field trip do not exist in a majority of the school districts.

3. The major responsibility for the determination of acceptability of field trip sites lies within the school building (i.e. the building principal and/or individual teacher). The role of the central office varies with the size of the district.

4. Many diverse criteria are used in the determination of the acceptability of field trip sites. One criterion was identified with greater frequency than any others - the field trip sites must be educationally significant and suitable to the educational program (curriculum). There is no statistical relationship between school districts and community size and the criteria used in the determination of educational acceptability of field trip sites.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The findings, conclusions, and a review of the many aspects of the study indicated that the following recommendations for further study should be considered.

1. That a replication of this study be conducted in three to five years.

2. There is need to study teacher utilization of field trips. Investigation in this area appears to be warranted in view of the fact that many considerations undoubtedly influence teachers in their choice of trips.

3. Investigation should be made concerning the involvement of teachers in the selection and evaluation of field trips and sites.

BIBLOIGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of School Administrators, Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Schools, Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1955.

Anderson, W. B., "Is Their Journey Really Necessary," The Times Educational Supplement, 3041:41-42, September 7, 1973.

Ayars, Albert Lee, "An Evaluation of Cooperatively Planned Resources Workshops for Teachers," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, State College of Washington, Pullman, 1956.

Bretsch, Howard S., "Boards of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, third edition, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960, pp. 150-54.

Clark, Ella C., "An Experimental Evaluation of the School Excursion," Journal of Experimental Education, 12: 10-19, September, 1943.

Curtis, Dwight K., "The Contributions of the Excursion to Understanding," Journal of Educational Research, 38:201-11, November, 1944.

Dale, E., Finn, J. D., and Hoban, C. F., "Research of Audio-Visual Materials," National Study for the Study of Education, pp. 253-93, fortyeighth yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, part 1, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1949.

DuVall, Charles Robert and Truex, Donald Walter, "Computerized Community Resources Handbook: A Joint Project of Indiana University at South Bend and the South Bend Community School Corp.," Research in Education 6:9 September, 1971, p. 104 (ED 051 049).

Forester, Edith C., "An Evaluation of the Field Trip in the Formation of Social Concepts and Generalizations," Dissertation Abstracts, 22:181, July-September, 1961.

Goldhammer, Keith, The School Board, The Library of Education Series, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Good, Carter V., (ed.), Dictionary of Education, third edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Greider, Calvin, Truman M. Pierce, and William Everett Rosenstengel, Public School Administration, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.

Hall, Wendy, "School Journeys in British Education," School and Society, 82:151-53, November 12, 1955.

Harvey, Helen W., "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Field Trips Upon the Development of Scientific Attitudes in a Ninth Grade General Science Class," General Education, 35:242-48, December, 1951.

Howland, Aldene E., How to Conduct a Field Trip, National Council for the Social Studies, "How to Do It Series, No. 12," National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1962.

Knezevich, Stephen J., Administration of Public Education, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Krepel, Wayne J. and DuVall, Charles R., "A Study of School Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for Dealing With Field Trips in School Districts in Cities With Populations Over 100,000 in the United States," Research in Education 8:1, January, 1973, p. 30 (ED 066 810).

Lawson, Douglas E., School Administration: Procedures and Practices, New York: The Odyssey Press, 1953.

Moehlman, Arthur B., School Administration, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Mort, Paul R., and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration, second edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

Muente, Grace, "A Walk Turned a Roomful of Individuals Into a Sharing First Grade," The Instructor, 77:40, August, 1967.

Nuhlicek, Allen L., "Orientation Centers for In-Migrants and Transients," The Education Digest, 32:8-11, April, 1967.

Olson, Lynn, "Planning for Success," The Instructor, 81:26-28, June, 1972.

Patterson's American Education, 1972 (Volume LXVIII), Mt. Prospect, Ill.: Educational Directories, Inc., 1971.

Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, School Executives Guide, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Ruth, Ferdinand S., "Field Trips - Why and How," The American Biology Teacher, 24:32-33, January, 1962.

Sebolt, Alberta P., "The Community as a Learning Laboratory," Educational Leadership, 29:410-12, February, 1972.

Sorrentino, Anthony V. and Bell, Paul E., "A Comparison of Attributed Values With Empirically Determined Values of Secondary School Science Field Trips," Science Education, 54:233-36, July, 1970.

The Association of Teachers of Social Studies of the City of New York, Handbook for Social Studies Teaching, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Wynn, D. Richard, Organization of Public Schools, The Library of Education Series, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND
1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND INDIANA 46615

ON OF EDUCATION
TEL. NO 219--282-2341

April 1, 1973

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of a sample of school districts throughout the United States to determine their school board policies regarding teacher use of the field trip as an instructional aid.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the current policies and practices for dealing with this educational tool. Your participation in this study is requested. Your school district will not be identified by name in the study, only an analysis of the responses and materials provided will be made.

If you want a summary of the results of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with your questionnaire. You will receive the summary when the study is completed.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wayne O. Krepel
Associate Professor
of Education

_____ (for office use only)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about your school district. Check the appropriate response(s) where applicable.

Size of community which your school district serves:

1.
___ Rural
___ Suburban
___ Village (under 10,000)
___ Town (10-50,000)
___ City (50,000+)

Which one of the following best describes your school district?

2.
___ A district with a majority of students drawn from a low socio-economic background.
___ A district with students drawn mainly from farming and/or ranching background.
___ A district with a majority of students drawn from a suburban background (i.e. living outside a city or town but not being of an agricultural background).
___ An "average" district where no one type of background predominates.
___ Other (please comment): _____

_____

What is the total size of your high school(s) graduating class for this school year (June, 1973)?

3.
___ 1 - 25
___ 26 - 50
___ 51 - 100
___ 101 - 200
___ 201 - 300
___ 301 - 400
___ 401 - 500
___ 501+

Definition: Field Trip syn. Instructional Trip, a trip arranged by a teacher or other school official and undertaken for educational purposes; the transportation of pupils to places where the materials of instruction may be observed and studied directly in their functional setting, such as a trip to a factory or city water works. (Good, C.V., Dictionary of Education, 1959, p. 291)

POLICY:

Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the use of field trips by teachers?

4. ___ Yes ___ No

5. Is this policy written? ___ Yes ___ No

If answer to above is "yes" please enclose a copy of this written policy with your reply, if readily available.

Does your policy permit the use of field trips by teachers with their classes?

6. ___ Yes ___ No

PROCEDURES:

Which person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of field trip sites (destinations)?

7.
___ Individual teacher
___ Building Principal
___ Building Curriculum Committee
___ Curriculum Supervisor(s)
___ System-wide Curriculum Committee
___ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
___ Superintendent of Schools
___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

Please TURN PAGE to complete this survey.

What are the criteria used for determining the educational acceptability of field trip sites (destination)?

8.
___ Educational significance/suitability
___ Distance (accessibility)
___ Safety
___ Relationship to grade or maturity level of students
___ Administrator(s) and/or teacher judgment (approval)
___ Availability of time away from school
___ Teachers previously visited site
___ Cost
___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

Does your district carry insurance for pupils and teachers covering possible injury and liability while on a field trip?

9.

___ Yes ___ No

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

Does your school district policy make any specific mention of acceptable means of transportation permitted to be used?

10.

___ Yes ___ No

Transportation permitted to be used:

11. ___ Walking
___ Private car
___ Other (please specify)
___ School Bus
___ Public Transportation

_____

_____

Please use this space for any additional comments or remarks you care to make concerning field trips:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

. . . . . .

NOTE: If you would like a summary of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with this questionnaire to:

Wayne J. Krepel
Indiana University at South Bend
1825 Northside Boulevard
South Bend, Indiana 46615

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND
1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615

ON OF EDUCATION

TEL. NO. 219- -282-2141

April 1, 1973

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of a sample of school districts throughout the United States to determine their school board policies regarding teacher use of the field trip as an instructional aid.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the current policies and practices for dealing with this educational tool. Your participation in this study is requested. Your school district will not be identified by name in the study, only an analysis of the responses and materials provided will be made.

If you want a summary of the results of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with your questionnaire. You will receive the summary when the study is completed.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wayne J. Krepel
Associate Professor
of Education

his request was
iously sent you. I hope
you will be able to
cooperate with me.
additional materials
enclosed.
Thanks.
WJK 6-12-73